TABLE 1: PERFORMANCE MONITOR PLAN FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR  | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA<br>SOURCE                           | METHOD/APPROACH OF<br>DATA COLLECTION   | DATA COLLATION, VALIDATION<br>AND ANALYSIS                           |  | DATA REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION | REP  | ORTING                             |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------------------|
|   |   |  |   | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY   | RESPONSIBLE PARTY  |   | SCHEDULE BY<br>REPORT  | RESPONSIBLE PARTY                  |
| STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: I  | Protection of selected LAC pa   | arks and reserves imp                    | ortant to conserve the Hemisphe   | re's biological diversity  | <i>J</i> .   |   |  |                                    |
| Number and area of targeted parks and protected areas with adequate management. | Definition: Adequate management includes: (a) Immediate conservation threats deterred; (b) A long-term management plan being developed; (c) Long term financial plan in progress and funding ensured for recurrent operation costs; (d) A local constituency actively participating in supporting site protection.  Unit: Number of sites/Cumulative hectares | The Nature<br>Conservancy,<br>local NGOs | Consolidation site report from The Nature Conservancy, written in cooperation with the local NGO and LAC Mission. | Annually  Baseline: 1990  None of the sites had adequate management. | S.O. Team,<br>especially staff<br>from LAC/RSD/E,<br>G/ENV, LAC<br>Missions, Regional<br>Environmental<br>Advisors, and The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes                                       | Annually/April  Note that for sites scheduled to consolidate at the end of a fiscal year, consolidation reports are due in June. | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |

<sup>\*</sup> Financing of Monitoring Plan: Funding for monitoring comes from Parks in Peril activity funds.

<sup>\*</sup> Involvement of Partners: The Nature Conservancy, our primary partner NGO, was instrumental in the development of this monitoring plan. They have participated as equal partners in the selection of the strategic objective, intermediate results, and indicators, and have shared earlier drafts with local NGO partners. Local NGO partners will actively gather data, and provide feedback on the effectiveness of this monitoring plan during its implementation.

TABLE 2: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR  | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT   | DATA<br>SOURCE             | METHOD/<br>APPROACH OF<br>DATA<br>COLLECTION                     |   | PILATION,<br>AND ANALYSIS               | DATA<br>REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION? | REPORTING             |                                    |
|---|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
|   |  |                            |  | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY                                  | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY                    |   | SCHEDULE BY<br>REPORT | RESPONSIBLE PARTY                  |
| INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1: St   | rengthened on-site capacity for  | long-term protection of ta | geted parks and reserves.  |   |   |   |                       |                                    |
| Sites with adequate     number of trained park guards     and protected areas     specialists | Definition: Adequacy determined by needs assessment set forth in original site workplans.  Unit: Number of sites   | The Nature<br>Conservancy  | Monitored by yearly evaluations compared to original assessment. | Annually  Baseline: 1991, zero sites met this standard. | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes   | Annually/<br>April    | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |
| 1.2 Sites with needed protection infrastructure established.                                  | Definition: Infrastructure may include park guard stations, information centers, etc. Adequacy determined by needs assessment set forth in original site workplans Unit: Number of sites | The Nature<br>Conservancy  | Monitored by yearly evaluations compared to original assessment. | Annually  Baseline: 1991 zero sites met this standard.  | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes   | Annually/<br>April    | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |
| 1.3 Sites with adequately demarcated and patrolled park boundaries                            | Definition: Adequacy<br>determined by assessing<br>critical boundaries according<br>to needs assessment set<br>forth in original site workplans<br>Unit: Number of sites                 | The Nature<br>Conservancy  | Monitored by yearly evaluations compared to original assessment. | Annually  Baseline: 1991 zero sites met this standard   | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes   | Annually/<br>April    | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |
|   | Definition: Unit:  |                            |  |   |   |   |                       |                                    |
| COMMENTS/NOTES:   |  |                            |  |   |   |   |                       |                                    |

TABLE 3: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR  | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT   | DATA<br>SOURCE            | METHOD/<br>APPROACH OF<br>DATA COLLECTION             | DATA COMPILATION,<br>VALIDATION, AND ANALYSIS  |   | DATA REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION? | REPORTING             |                                    |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--|
|   |  |                           |   | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY   | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY                    |  | SCHEDULE BY<br>REPORT | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY               |  |
| INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2: Strengthened capacity of partner NGOs for sustainable long-term management of targeted parks and reserves. |  |                           |   |  |   |  |                       |                                    |  |
| 2.1 Number of NGOs that have met and continue to meet the PiP institutional administrative and management criteria.               | Definition: Criteria include: (a) management and financial report submitted; (b) pass audit; (c) complete work plans; (d) submit annual evaluations; (e) personnel development; (f) project implementation  Unit: Number of local partner NGOs   | The Nature<br>Conservancy | Assessment performed yearly by The Nature Conservancy | Annual and more frequently as appropriate.  Baseline: 1990: Zero NGOs met this criteria; 1991: nine NGOs met the criteria. | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes  | Annual                | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |  |
| 2.2 Number of NGOs involved in policy interventions: Number of policy interventions undertaken per year.                          | Definition: Policy interventions include those contributing to the development and implementation of improved government policies and partnerships affecting park management. This includes activities such as public planning processes, park (and related) regulations and enforcement. Unit: Annual: Number of NGOs/ Number of policy interventions | The Nature<br>Conservancy | Tabulated yearly by The<br>Nature Conservancy         | Annually  Baseline: 1994 14 NGOs involved with 64 policy interventions   | S.O. Team; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes  | Annual/April          | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeff Brokaw    |  |
|   | Definition:  |                           |   |  |   | _  |                       |                                    |  |
|   | Unit:  |                           |   |  |   |  |                       |                                    |  |

COMMENTS/NOTES: NGOs include those not supported by PiP directly, but have worked in concert with partner NGOs.

TABLE 4: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR  | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | TION AND SOURCE OF VALIDATION, AND ANALYS: T OF DATA COLLECTION                                 |  | SOURCE OF VALIDATION, AND ANALYSIS IN DATA COLLECTION AV  |   | DATA<br>REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION? | REP   | ORTING                             |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
|   |   |   |  | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY  | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY                    |   | SCHEDULE BY<br>REPORT   | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY               |  |  |  |
| INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3:  | INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3: Community constituency developed to support sustainable management of targeted parks and reserves.   |   |  |   |   |   |   |                                    |  |  |  |
| 3.1 Proportion of the local constituency aware of the importance of local park/reserve site.      | Definition: "Awareness" includes: (a) awareness of location of park boundaries and/or zones and reasons for placement of those boundaries; (b) ability to articulate the ecological, economic, and health benefits accrued to local communities due to existence of park; and (c) recognition and understanding of the objectives of particular projects being conducted in or around the park (e.g., sustainable forestry management). | From annual evaluations,<br>Human Ecological<br>Profiles conducted by<br>The Nature Conservancy | Human Ecological Profiles include, for community members: socioeconomic status; health; resource use; local social and political structures; awareness of protected areas objectives; history of participation in protected area decision making and management. | Yearly at selected sites. More sites incorporated over time as methodology improves.  Baseline: 1995 No surveys completed but assumed very low. | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Yes   | Annually/<br>April<br>or more<br>frequently as<br>appropriate | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |  |  |  |
| 3.2 Proportion of people engaged in conservation-<br>oriented activities in and around park site. | Definition: Examples of activities include ecotourism, small-scale organic agriculture, bee keeping, sustainable harvesting of wildlife and other non-timber forest products, etc.  Unit: # and % (by site, gender)   | The Nature Conservancy,<br>local partner NGOs   | Surveys  | Annually  Baseline: 1995  No official survey but assumed very low   | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Not yet                                       | Annually/<br>April  | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |  |  |  |
| 3.3 Number and proportion of people involved with consultation and decision-making at the site.   | Definition: Includes community members involved with park management planning.  Unit: # and % (by site, gender)   | The Nature Conservancy,<br>local partner NGOs   | Surveys  | Annually  Baseline: 1995  No official survey but assumed very low.  | S.O. Team, The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy | Not yet                                       | Annually/<br>April  | S.O. Team Leader<br>Jeffrey Brokaw |  |  |  |

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR | INDICATOR<br>DEFINITION AND<br>UNIT OF<br>MEASUREMENT | DATA<br>SOURCE |  |                        | DATA COMPILATION,<br>VALIDATION, AND ANALYSIS |  | REP                   | ORTING               |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|--|------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|
|                          |   |                |  | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY                          |  | SCHEDULE BY<br>REPORT | RESPONSIBLE<br>PARTY |
|                          |   |                |  |                        |   |  |                       |                      |
|                          |   |                |  |                        |   |  |                       |                      |
|                          |   |                |  |                        |   |  |                       |                      |

Comments on Intermediate Result number 3: Selected sites are used initially since these will be pilot activities for the first few years.

TABLE 5: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT   | DATA<br>SOURCE   | METHOD/ APPROACH<br>OF<br>DATA COLLECTION   | DATA COMPI<br>VALIDATION, AN<br>BY MIS                 | ND ANALYSIS                            | DATA<br>REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION?  | REPO                  | REPORTING                             |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  |   | SCHEDULE/<br>FREQUENCY                                 | RESPONSIB<br>LE PARTY                  |  | SCHEDULE<br>BY REPORT | RESPONSIBL<br>E PARTY                 |  |
| INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4: N   | on-USAID funding attained or created   | for parks and reserve  | s protection.   |  |  | <u>,                                      </u> |                       | 1                                     |  |
| 4.1 Annual local government and NGO contributions for park protection and reserve protection.                        | Definition: Annual targets determined by projected government contributions in workplans.  Unit: US\$\$  | The Nature Conservancy, local partner NGOs; Information on actual contributions derived from Ouarterly Financial Billing Reports to USAID. | Quarterly Financial Billing reports for each site will show government and NGO financial contributions. | Annual  Baseline: 1991 = \$179,000; \$ 17,900 per site | S.O.Team,<br>The Nature<br>Conservancy | Not yet  | Annual/<br>April      | S.O. Team<br>Leader Jeffrey<br>Brokaw |  |
| 4.2 Number of parks and reserves with long term management plans completed and updated regularly by GO/NGO partners. | Definition: This is a key indicator of a site's ability to achieve long term non-USAID support for its survival as a viable area. An updated financial plan indicates that a de facto management plan exists upon which were based the activities "costed out" and budgeted in the financial plan. These plans include the selection of the most important and feasible activities for park protection, and insure that sufficient income exists or can be realistically projected to cover these activities.  Unit: Number of park/reserve sites. | The Nature<br>Conservancy, local<br>Partner NGOs.  | Completed Financial Reports.  | Annual<br>Baseline: zero                               | SO. Team,<br>The Nature<br>Conservancy |  |                       |                                       |  |

U:\drpub\ees\pip\monitor.pln

TABLE 6: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE'S CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

| PERFORMANCE<br>INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT   | DATA<br>SOURCE  | METHOD/APPROACH OF<br>DATA COLLECTION  | DATA COME<br>VALIDATI<br>ANAL              | ON, AND  | DATA<br>REGULARLY<br>AVAILABLE AT<br>MISSION | REPO                       | RTING   |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|---|
|  |  |   |  | SCHEDULE/                                  | RESPONSIBLE  |  | SCHEDULE BY                | RESPONSIBLE   |
| STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:   | Protection of selected LAC parks and reserves  | important to conser   | ve the hemisphere's biological diversity   | <i>j.</i>                                  |  |  |                            |   |
| Social and political unrest<br>does not jeopardize the ability<br>to improve park management.  | Definition: Social and political unrest may involve guerrilla warfare, civil war, strikes, etc. Unit:  | USAID LAC<br>Missions and<br>Embassies; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy; local<br>NGOs | Periodic informal updates from USAID Missions and cables from the State Department; quarterly reports and annual reports from The Nature Conservancy; periodic informal updates from The Nature Conservancy. | Quarterly or more frequently as necessary. | SO Team; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy;<br>relevant LAC<br>Missions | Not applicable                               | At least semi-<br>annually | S.O. Team<br>Leader Jeff<br>Brokaw; LAC<br>Mission<br>Environmental<br>Officers |
| Host government support maintained or increased  | Definition: Support may include financial, social, or political elements.  Unit:   | USAID LAC<br>Missions and<br>Embassies; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy; local<br>NGOs | Periodic informal updates from USAID Missions and cables from the State Department; quarterly reports and annual reports from The Nature Conservancy; periodic informal updates from The Nature Conservancy. | Quarterly or more frequently as necessary  | SO Team; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy;<br>relevant LAC<br>Missions | Not applicable                               | At least semi-<br>annually | S.O. Team<br>Leader Jeff<br>Brokaw; LAC<br>Mission<br>Environmental<br>Officers |
| 3. Counterpart funding from<br>government, LAC Missions,<br>The Nature Conservancy, and<br>local partner NGOs is<br>forthcoming at anticipated<br>amounts. | Definition: Counterpart funding as expected in USAID's cooperative agreement with The Nature Conservancy for the Parks in Peril program.  Unit: US\$ | USAID LAC<br>Missions; The<br>Nature Conservancy                                    | Quarterly and annual financial reports from<br>The Nature Conservancy; periodic informal<br>communities with LAC Missions and The<br>Nature Conservancy  | Quarterly or more frequently as necessary  | SO Team; The<br>Nature<br>Conservancy                              | Yes  | Quarterly                  | SO Team<br>Leader Jeff<br>Brokaw  |
| 4.   | Definition:<br>Unit:   |   |  |  |  |  |                            |   |
|  |  | <u> </u>  |  |  |  |  |                            |   |